### DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

# Before the Federal Communications Commission Washington, D.C. 20554

PECEIVED

FORM COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Administration of the	)	
North American Numbering Plan	)	
Carrier Identification Codes (CICs)	)	CC Docket No. 92-237
	)	
MCI Telecommunications Corporation	)	
Petition for Emergency Stay	)	

## COMMENTS OF SOUTHWESTERN BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY, PACIFIC BELL AND NEVADA BELL

Southwestern Bell Telephone Company ("Southwestern Bell"), Pacific Bell and Nevada Bell (collectively referenced as the "SBC Telephone Companies") submit these Comments in opposition to the Petition for Emergency Stay filed by MCI Telecommunications Corporation ("MCI") on August 12, 1998 in the above-captioned proceeding in an 11<sup>th</sup> hour attempt to delay the September 1, 1998 deadline date for the blocking of 3-digit carrier identification code ("CIC") calls from end-offices converted to 4-digit CICs. The contentions made by MCI do not support the extraordinary remedy sought nor does MCI cite sufficient evidence in support of these speculative claims.

#### I. THE MCI PETITION IS INHERENTLY FLAWED.

MCI seeks the following action from the Commission: (1) that BellAtlantic be directed to immediately halt its "CIC transition" and that the other local exchange carriers' ("LECs") August 14, 1998 responses to the Common Carrier Bureau's request

No. of Copies rec'd U

for information be analyzed within ten (10) days of their submission to determine if similar action is warranted in their territories; (2) that all LECs be directed to provide intercept announcements, without "excessive ringing", for access code calls placed with 3-digit CICs and; (3) that the September 1, 1998 deadline for the blocking of 3-digit CICs be stayed by ordering all LECs to immediately halt CIC transition related activity "until the Bureau determines that dial around service integrity is maintained." MCI makes two "factual" contentions in support of this remedy. First, MCI contends that the LECs are not appropriately applying intercept announcement messages for 3-digit CICs, allowing a call to ring as many as twenty times before the message is transmitted. Although MCI claims all LECs are guilty of this alleged transgression, the only specific results cited by MCI pertain to field tests allegedly conducted with regard to BellAtlantic service. The second argument made by MCI is the claim that the status of the LECs' conversion schedule "indicates that the delayed intercept announcement issue will only grow."

MCI's Petition is inherently flawed. The remedy sought is vague and, in certain respects, appears contradictory. Would MCI have the Commission review the LECs' responses to its information request in assessing whether a stay of CIC transition activity beyond BellAtlantic territory is warranted or simply issue a nationwide stay without such an analysis? Moreover, at what point can the stay be lifted if the criteria to be used is the maintenance of dial around "service integrity"?

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> MCI Petition, pp. 8-9.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> MCI Petition, p. 4

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> MCI Petition, pp. 5-6.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> MCI Petition, p. 6.

MCI's Petition also does not contain any credible proof which would support the Commission's granting of this extraordinary remedy. MCI fails to cite any quantifiable evidence of a nationwide delay in the processing of the intercept announcements. There is no evidence whatsoever that the current conversion schedule could in anyway heighten or contribute to any intercept announcement delay, assuming one in fact exists. There is no correlation drawn between the conversion schedule and the "technical deficiency" argued by MCI. There is no demonstrable, objective proof of customer confusion or service degradation resulting from any perceived intercept message delay. In short, MCI's Petition lacks sufficient credible and quantifiable evidence upon which to base the imposition of a nationwide stay.

## II. THE RESULTS OF THE FIELD TESTS CONDUCTED WITHIN THE TERRITORIES OF THE SBC TELEPHONE COMPANIES CONTRADICT THE GENERAL ASSERTIONS OF MCI.

In assessing MCI's claims, it is important to understand the intercept message process. The CIC-related intercept announcement was implemented by the SBC Telephone Companies in the same manner as all other standard announcements. In the "post permissive" environment, if a customer dials a 3-digit CIC from a 4-digit CIC converted end office, the call is routed in the converted end office to the intercept announcement. This same process applies to all announcements. The only difference is the content of the message received by the caller. The number of audible rings before the message is received is not a variable. Typically, a caller receives an announcement within 15 to 18 seconds, or 2 to 3 rings, hardly an excessive delay.<sup>5</sup> There is no queuing

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> If a caller did encounter a prolonged ringing period beyond 4 rings, it would indicate a serious problem with simply an individual switch and corrective action would be taken.

of calls for intercept announcements. The Southwestern Bell Telephone Companies cannot conceive of any nationwide "technical deficiency", such as that purported by MCI to exist, which would consistently and across-the-board result in a delay of 100 seconds on intercept messages for CIC-related calls.

MCI's claim that a customer placing a call utilizing a 3-digit CIC from a post-permissive end office will experience a delay of up to 20 rings before receiving an intercept message<sup>7</sup> also is contradicted by the field tests performed by the SBC Telephone Companies. Field tests have been conducted by the SBC Telephone Companies since the conversion process began. These tests did not reveal a pattern of excessive ringing of the nature described by MCI.<sup>8</sup>

In response to the filing of MCI's Petition, the SBC Telephone Companies conducted still further testing in all of their major metropolitan areas in California, Nevada, Missouri, Texas, Kansas, Oklahoma and Arkansas. Test calls were made from converted end offices utilizing the primary carrier access codes based on 3-digit CICs for AT&T, MCI, Sprint and WorldComm. A total of approximately 300 representative

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> All announcements, including those pertaining to CIC-related calls, are handled in accordance with Bellcore's Local Switching System Generic Requirements ("LSSGR"). These requirements provide, "If an announcement is configured for non-barge-in operations, [a converted end office] shall provide the means to connect the calling [party] to the start of the announcement within 18 seconds…"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> MCI Petition, p. 1.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> As new recorded announcements are turned up, it is standard procedure for technicians to check for proper call completion and the correct wording of the announcement. During the phased-in implementation of 4-digit CICs, test calls also were made following the input of translations for the "permissive dialing" period and the "post-permissive" period.

switches were tested.<sup>9</sup> In all of these test calls, no more than 3 rings occurred before the intercept announcement was transmitted and received. The maximum "delay" in connecting the intercept announcement was 18 seconds, far short of the 100 second delay claimed by MCI.<sup>10</sup>

Despite MCI's claim of customer confusion, the Southwestern Bell Telephone

Companies have not received any customer complaints related to any delay in receiving
the intercept announcement since the post-permissive conversion process began in July
1998. If MCI's customers are confused, it is more likely due to MCI's delay in
implementing its customer education program and not due to any delay in the processing
of the announcement.

## III. GIVEN THE STATUS OF THE SBC TELEPHONE COMPANIES CONVERSION PROCESS, A STAY OF THE CONVERSION PROCESS WOULD BE CONTRARY TO THE PUBLIC INTEREST.

As the SBC Telephone Companies related in their response dated August 14, 1998 to the Common Carrier Bureau, Pacific Bell and Nevada Bell are very close to completing the conversion of their end offices to accept only 4-digit CICs.<sup>12</sup> Once this is

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> Specifically, 73 1A switches, 92 5ESS switches, 71 DMS 100 switches and 41 Ericsson switches were tested. At least five calls utilizing the most common 5-digit carrier access codes were placed to each switch.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> With regard to the DMS 100 and the Ericsson switches, there was a delay of 0 to 3 rings. For the 1A and the 5ESS switches, the intercept message was transmitted and received within 1 to 3 rings.

<sup>&</sup>quot;MCI and other interexchange carriers have had three years in order to educate their customers as to the inevitable 3-digit CIC blocking. The phased-in conversion process has provided these entities with an ample opportunity to facilitate their customers' understanding. It is to be expected given MCI's dilatory customer education efforts that its customers are experiencing some confusion.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> Only two switches remain to be converted as of this date and this conversion activity is scheduled to be completed by August 21, 1998.

done, all calls to carrier access codes based on 3-digit CICs in these territories will be routed to intercept announcements as outlined above. Southwestern Bell also will complete this process by the September 1, 1998 due date and has already converted more than 80% of its end offices. By the time the Commission issues its order in response to the MCI Petition, this conversion percentage will be even greater.

There has been no evidence offered by MCI that there is any delay in the transmission of the intercept messages being received by callers dialing carrier access codes based on 3-digit CICs from the SBC Telephone Companies converted offices. Nor has MCI offered any evidence of this nature concerning any of the other LECs, apart from BellAtlantic. Yet, MCI speculates that the nationwide "problem" with excessive ringing that it claims to have identified, if not substantiated, will be compounded if the LECs proceed to convert their end offices in accordance with the Commission's prescribed schedule. Based upon this speculation, MCI argues that a stay would be in the public interest.

Clearly it is not in the public interest to delay the culmination of a long planned cut-off until an indeterminate date. While there is no evidence of widespread customer confusion resulting from any delay in the transmission of intercept announcements, a stay at the 11<sup>th</sup> hour in this implementation would unquestionably confuse the public. Most of the LECs have completed, or are in the final stages of completing, the conversion process. The vast majority of the parties effected by the CIC conversion have diligently educated their customers concerning the conversion's ramifications. Yet, imagine trying to explain to a customer why for an indeterminate period of time, he can make a dial around call to the same location with the same carrier in one part of the country using one

number, but cannot make the same call with the same carrier using the same dialing pattern in another part of the country. To stay the implementation at this stage will only compound public confusion; it certainly will do nothing to alleviate it as MCI would have the Commission believe.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

MCI's Petition for Emergency Stay is not supported by the evidence. Rather it consists of overbroad generalizations and speculation based on questionable proof concerning a single LEC. Moreover, even if sufficient proof had been submitted of a nationwide practice, there has been no demonstrated detriment sustained by the dialaround industry or the public. Given these deficiencies, MCI's Petition falls woefully short of the standards required for an emergency stay, particularly one sought only a few short weeks before the culmination of a long-planned implementation.

Respectfully submitted,

SOUTHWESTERN BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY,

PACIFIC BELL AND NEVADA BELL Thursall lays

Robert M. Lynch

Durward D. Dupre

Hope Thurrott

One Bell Plaza, Room 3023

Dallas, Texas 75202

Attorneys for Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, Pacific Bell and Nevada Bell.

August 19, 1998

### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Myra D. Creeks, hereby certify that "Comments of Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, Pacific Bell and Nevada Bell," in Docket No. 92-237 have been served on August 19, 1998, to the Parties of Record.

Myra D. Creeks

August 19, 1998

ITS INC 1231 20TH STREET NW WASHINGTON DC 20036 CHIEF NETWORK SERVICES DIVISION 2000 M STREET NW ROOM 235 WASHINGTON DC 20554

(2 COPIES)

EDWARD R WHOLL CAMPBELL L AYLING NEW ENGLAND TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH COMPANY 111 WESTCHESTER AVE WHITE PLAINS NY 10604 FLOYD S KEENE LARRY A PECK MARK R ORTLIEB AMERITECH 2000 W AMERITECH CENTER DRIVE ROOM 4H86 HOFFMAN ESTATES IL 60196-1025

COLEEN M EGAN HELMREICH U S WEST INC 1020 19TH STREET NW SUITE 700 WASHINGTON DC 20036 M ROBERT SUTHERLAND BELLSOUTH CORPORATION 1155 PEACHTREE ST NE SUITE 1700 ATLANTA GEORGIA 30309-3610

LINDA D HERSHMAN SOUTHERN NEW ENGLAND TELECOMMUNICATIONS CORP 227 CHURCH STREET NEW HAVEN CONNECTICUT 06510 DAVID L MEIER
DIRECTOR-LEGISLATIVE & REGUATORY
PLANNING
CINCINNATI BELL
201 E 4TH STREET
PO BOX 2301
CINCINNATI OHIO 45201

DARRELL S TOWNSLEY
ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION
160 NORTH LASALLE STREET
SUITE C-800
CHICAGO IL 60601

JOSEPHINE S TRUBEK ROCHESTER TELEPHONE CORPORATION 180 SOUTH CLINTON AVENUE ROCHESTER NEW YORK 14646 PAUL RODGERS CHARLES D GRAY JAMES BRADFORD RAMSAY NARUC 1102 ICC BUILDING PO BOX 684 WASHINGTON DC 20044 JAMES L CASEY
AIR TRANSPORT ASSOCIATION
OF AMERICA
1301 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW
WASHINGTON DC 20004

JOHN L BARTLETT ROBERT J BUTLER AERONAUTICAL RADIO INC 1776 K STREET NW WASHINGTON DC 20006 DANIEL L BRENNER
DAVID L NICOLL
NCTA
1724 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE NW
WASHINGTON DC 20036

DAVID C HENNY WHIDBEY TELEPHONE COMPANY 2747 E STATE HIGHWAY 525 LANGLEY WASHINGTON 98260-9799 A A KURTZE CENTEL CORPORATION 8725 HIGGING ROAD CHICAGO IL 60631

DAVID COSSON NTCA 2626 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW WASHINGTON DC 20037 DAVID J GUDINO GTE SERVICE CORPORATION 1850 M STREET NW SUITE 1200 WASHINGTON DC 20036

LORETTA J GARCIA DONALD J ELARDO MCI TELECOMMUNICATIONS CORP 1801 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW WASHINGTON DC 20006 PETER GUGGINA ROBERT W TRAYLOR JR CONSULTANTS FOR MCI 2400 N GLENVILLE DRIVE RICHARDSON TX 75082 JOHN M GOODMAN KAREN ZACHARIA ATTORNEYS FOR BELL ATLANTIC 1133 20TH ST NW WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 MARK R HAMILTON
MARSHA OLCH
MCCAW CELLULAR COMMUNICATIONS INC
5400 CARILLON POINT
KIRKLAND WA 98033

JAMES S BLASZAK
FRANCIS E FLETCHER JR
ATTORNEYS FOR AD HOC TELECOMM
USERS COMMITTEE
GARDNER CARTON & DOUGLAS
1301 K STREET NW
SUITE 900 - EAST TOWER
WASHINGTON DC 20005

MARK C ROSENBLUM ROY E HOFFINGER JUDY SELLO ATTORNEYS FOR AT&T CORP 295 N MAPLE AVENUE ROOM 3244J1 BASKING RIDGE NJ 07920-1092

R MICHAEL SENKOWSKI JEFFREY S LINDER DANIEL J SMITH WILEY REIN & FIELDING 1776 K STREET NW WASHINGTON DC 20006 H R BURROWS NETWORK RESOURCE RESEARCH F4 160 ELGIN STREET OTTOWA ONTARIO CANADA KIG 314

ANDREW D LIPMAN RUSSELL M BLAU SWIDLER & BERLIN CHARTERED 3000 K STREET NW WASHINGTON DC 20007 JAY C KEITHLEY LEON KESTENBAUM NORINA T MOY SPRINT CORPORATION 1850 M STREET NW SUITE 1100 WASHINGTON DC 20036

MARY MCDERMOTT ASSOCIATE GENERAL COUNSEL USTA 1401 H STREET NW STE 600 WASHINGTON DC 20005-2136 W RICHARD MORRIS SPRINT CORPORATION PO BOX 11315 KANSAS CITY MO 64112 WILLIAM J COWAN NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SERVICE TRHEE EMPIRE STATE PLAZA ALBANY NY 12223 JONATHAN D BLAKE
ELLEN K SNYDER
COVINGTON & BURLING
1201 PENNSYLVANIA AVENYUE NW
PO BOX 7566
WASHINGTON DC 20044

CARL WAYNE SMITH
CHIEF REGULATORY COUNSEL
TELECOMMUNICATIONS (DOD)
CODE AR
DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS
AGENCY
701 S COURTHOUSE ROAD
ARLINGTON VIRGINIA 22204

MICHAEL G HOFFMAN ESQ VICE PRESIDENT LEGAL & REGULATORY AFFAIRS VARTEC TELECOM INC 3200 WEST PLEASANT RUN ROAD LANCASTER TEXAS 75146

W THEODORE PIERSON JR RICHARD M METZGER COUNSEL FOR ALTS PIERSON & TUTTLE 888 17TH STREET NW SUITE 900 WASHINGTON DC 20006 HEATHER BURNETT TOLD PRESIDENT-ALTS 1200 19TH STREET NW SUITE 607 WASHINGTON DC 20036

DR LEE L SELWYN ECONOMICS AND TECHNOLOGY INC ONE WASHINGTON MALL BOSTON MASSACHUSETTS 02108 DAVID J GUDINO 1850 M STREET NW SUTIE 1200 WASHINGTON DC 20036

RICHARD A ASKOFF ATTORNEY FOR THE NATIONAL EXCHANGE CARRIER ASSOCIATION INC 100 SOUTH JEFFERSON ROAD WHIPPANY NJ 07981 M ROBERT SUTHERLAND
SHIRLEY A RANSOM
ATTORNEYS FOR BELLSOUTH
TELECOMMUNICATIONS INC
4300 SOUTHERN BELL CENTER
675 WEST PEACHTRE STREET NE
ATLANTA GEORGIA 30375

CINDY Z SCHONHAUT ESQ VICE PRESIDENT GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS MFS COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY INC 3000 K STREET NW SUITE 300 WASHINGTON DC 20007 ANDREW LIPMAN
ATTORNEY FOR MFS
SWIDLER & BERLIN CHARTERED
3000 K STREET NW
SUITE 300
WASHINGTON DC 20007

B C SCHUR RATES PLANNING AND REGULATORY SUPPORT STENTOR RESOURCE CENTRE INC 160 ELGIN ST FLOOR 22 OTTAWA ONTARIO K1G3J4 DAVID A GROSS WASHINGTON COUNSEL FOR AIRTOUCH COMMUNICATIONS 1818 N STREET NW WASHINGTON DC 20036

PAMELA J RILEY DIRECTOR-PUBLIC POLICY AIRTOUCH COMMUNICATIONS ONE CALIFORNIA ST 28TH FL SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111 THOMAS E TAYLOR
CHRISTOPHER J WILSON
ATTORNEYS FOR CINCINNATI BELL
TELEPHONE COMPANY
2500 PNC CENTER
201 EAST FIFTH STREET
CINCINNATI OHIO 45202

JULIA A WAYSDORF SWIDLER & BERLIN COUNSEL FOR TELCO COMMUNICATION GROUP 3000 K ST NW WASHINGTON, D.C. 20007 JEANNIE GRIMES FCC COMMON CARRIER BUREAU 2000 M STREET NW STE 235 WASHINGTON DC 20554 (2 COPIES)

CATHERINE R SLOAN RICHARD L FRUCHTERMAN RICHARD S WHITT WORLDCOM INC 1120 CONNECTICUT AVE N W SUITE 400 WASHINGTON D C 20036 MARY MCDERMOTT LINDA KENT KEITH TOWNSEND LAWRENCE E SARJEANT 1401 H STREET N W SUITE 600 LARRY A PECK COUNSEL FOR AMERITECH ROOM 4H86 2000 WEST AMERITECH CENTER DRIVE HOFFMAN ESTATES IL 60196-1025 KATHRYN MARIE KRAUSE SUITE 700 1020 19TH STREET N W WASHINGTON DC 20036

JOHN M GOODMAN ATTORNEY FOR BELL ATLANTIC 1300 I STREET N W WASHINGTON D C 20005 M ROBERT SOUTHERLAND THEODORE R KINGSLEY ITS ATTORNEYS SUITE 1700 1155 PEACHTREE N E ATLANTA GEORGIA 30309-3610

GLEN B MANISHIN MICHAEL D SPECHT SENIOR ENGINEER BLUMENFELD & COHEN - TECHNOLOGY LAW GROUP 1615 M STREET N W SUITE 700 WASHINGTON D C 20036 JUDITH L HARRIS BRENDA K PENNINGTON REED SMITH SHAW & MCCLAY LLP 1301 K STREET NW SUITE 1100 - EAST TOWER WASHINGTON DC 20005

JAMES U TROUP ROBERT H JACKSON ARTER & HADDEN LLP 1801 K STREET NW SUITE 400K WASHINGTON DC 20006-1301